

any other activity while you were in Moscow? A. Yes, I did.

Q. What else did you do? A. Well, I was a member of the Anglo-American Secretariat of the Communist International.

Q. Will you explain what the Anglo-American Secretariat of the Communist International was, as you understood it at that time? A. The Anglo-American Secretariat was a subsidiary set up in the headquarters structure of the Communist International, which dealt with affairs of English-speaking Communist Parties. On the Secretariat
3126 were representatives of the Communist Party of the United States, and Canada, and England, Ireland, Australia, and so on.

It received the reports coming to Moscow from these parties, discussed them, prepared recommendations for the higher bodies of the Communist International, and so on.

Q. And you were a member of this Secretariat? A. Yes.

3127 Q. In your attendance at the Lenin Institute, did you ever receive courses on the trade union movement? A. Yes, that was one of the subjects.

Q. Will you describe what you were taught regarding the trade union movement at the Lenin Institute? A. Well, that comprised the matter of how to organize communist
3f28 groups inside factories, or labor unions, how these groups were to prepare themselves for meetings of local unions, how to take advantage of certain grievances that the workers may have for the communist party's purposes, how to lead the activities in a strike, or towards a strike, and how to control a union once the communists are in control of it.

That is in brief—

Q. During the course of your instruction, were there any lectures as to the roles of the Communist Party in the event of a war between the United States and the Soviet Union? A. Yes.

Q. Will you describe what you were taught to be the role of the Communist Party in such an event? A. The role of the Communist Party in such an event was to work for the defeat of the country, in support of the Soviet Union.

Q. Was there any particular relation in that regard to the labor union movement? A. Yes, the relation was to carry on agitation and propaganda in such a way as to interfere with production and transport of munitions and war supplies.

Q. Now, when you left Moscow, I think you stated you went to South America? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Specifically, to what countries did you go?
3129 A. Colombia and Venezuela.

Q. Who sent you to these countries, if anyone?
A. I was sent there by the Presidium of the Communist International.

Q. For what purpose? A. In Colombia it was a matter of reorganizing a badly functioning party, and to teach them the methods of communist organization, and in Venezuela it was to organize an underground party from scratch.

3130 Q. Do you know of any specific individual? A.

Yes, Charles Crumbein was—that is of the American communists, Charles Crumbein was sent for activities outside of the United States for a period of time, and Rudolph Baker was sent to Korea for a time.

Q. What nationality was this Rudolph Baker? A. He was a Yugoslav.

Q. And he was sent to Korea? A. Yes.

Q. In what capacity, if you know? A. Well, he went there as a representative of the Communist International.

Q. Now, we have got you down in Colombia and Venezuela. I may have asked this before, but I will ask you

again: How long did you stay down there? A. I came to Colombia in June, 1930, stayed until, I believe, April, 1931. Then I went to Venezuela.

Q. Were you required to take any special training in addition to your attendance at the Lenin Institute for this position in South America? A. Yes.

Q. What kind of training were you required to take? A. Well, there was instruction in the secret department of the Comintern on how to use codes for communication, either in letters or cables, and also how to set up a radio station for short wave communications.

In addition to that, I met with the head of the Latin American Secretariat every day for at least an hour, to brief me on politics in South America. His name was Ercoli Togliatti, the present leader of the Italian Communist Party.

Then I met, for two hours every day, the two specialists of the Red Army who were specializing on methods of guerilla organization and guerilla warfare in agricultural countries.

Q. Mr. Kornfeder, were you told before you left Moscow how you would be financed, how you would be supported, how your activities would be supported while you were in South America? A. Yes.

Q. What were you told? A. I had an appropriation of \$15,000 for the first six months for these activities, that I was sent to carry out.

3132 Q. Did you take that money with you when you left Moscow? A. Some of it I took with me, and other sums were sent to me later.

Q. Directly from Moscow? A. They did not come directly from Moscow. They came to New York, first, and were sent from New York to Bogota, Colombia.

Q. Mr. Kornfeder, you stated that the money from
3133 Moscow was sent first to New York and then sent to you down in Bogota, Colombia? A. Yes sir.

Q. Do you know who sent it to you from New York?

A. Yes.

Q. Who was it? A. It was sent to me by Earl Browder.

Q. Who was Earl Browder at that time? A. He was then the General Secretary of the Communist Party.

3134 Q. Now let me get you back to Moscow, again, Mr. Kornfeder, and consider your membership in the Anglo-American Secretariat.

I recall that you stated that you received reports from the American Party in your official capacity as a member of the Anglo-American Secretariat. Is that correct? Did you state that? A. Yes.

Q. In those reports, or from those reports, did you become aware of a dispute in the leadership of the
3135 United Mine Workers of America?

The Witness: Yes.

By Mr. Lenvin:

Q. Now, do you know the leading participants in that dispute? A. Yes, I think I remember the participants. It was a dispute inside the United Mine Workers between the forces led by John L. Lewis and the ones led by the Communist Party together with certain dissenting elements that were fighting John L. Lewis at the time, specifically John Brophy and Alexander Howard and several others, and the Communist Party was very much interested in that dispute. It had an organization in the field to carry on its activities in connection with that dispute.

3136 Mr. LaFollette: The Communist Party where, Mr. Kornfeder?

The Witness: In the United States.

By Mr. Lenvin:

Q. Did the Communist Party ever recommend any action to be taken regarding this dispute, while you were a member of the Anglo-American Secretariat? A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall what that action was?

Mr. LaFollette: Excuse me, I would like to know now, when you have got a man in Moscow, whether you are referring to the Communist Party of the United States or of Soviet Russia.

Mr. Lenvin: When they recommended any action which they communicated to Moscow which he would learn as a member of the Anglo-American Secretariat in the normal course of his business.

Mr. LaFollette: I understand that, but I would like to know from the question whether you were speaking of the Communist Party of the United States or the Communist Party of Russia, in this question: If the Communist Party recommended something, you said.

Mr. Lenvin: The Communist Party of the United States, did it recommend or make requests to the Comintern?

Mr. LaFollette: All right.

3137 The Witness: Yes, there were recommendations and requests. The recommendations were in the form of minutes of the Political Committee, that would come to Moscow, and would, of course, be available to the members of the Anglo-American Secretariat, and which dealt with policy to be pursued in this fight inside the United Mine Workers. The requests usually would relate to sums of money to finance the fight.

By Mr. Lenvin:

Q. Now, on this request for sums of money, were you consulted? A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall what specific sum, if any, was requested?

A. The request I recall, and which in my opinion was solicited, was a request for \$50,000.

Q. Who consulted you? A. There is in the Comintern a special commission on subsidies. The ones that were present at the time were Pianatzky, then Melnichansky, who was at the time representing the council of the Russian Trade Unions, and Losovsky.

They were the three that I recall were present on that occasion, because the matter dealt with an appropriation for communist activities in the labor unions.

Q. What transpired at that meeting? A. Well, 3138 Losovsky expressed an opinion that this may be a request by the then Lovestone leadership to use funds of the Communist International for factional activities, even though formerly they asked for it in order to carry on activities inside of the United Mine Workers.

So since I represented the Foster faction, which opposed Lovestone, I was asked whether, in my opinion, this was a pretense to get funds for a faction fight instead of for activities in the United Mine Workers.

Q. What did you recommend? A. I recommended that they give an initial appropriation of \$25,000, because there was a fight going on in the United Mine Workers, and then check up, as to whether these \$25,000 were properly used for the purpose requested.

Q. Would you know whether or not your suggestion was adopted? A. As far as I know, yes.

Q. Would you know whether or not the money was then actually sent? A. Yes, as far as I know, it was sent.

3143 Q. Did you have occasion to hear the decision while you were in Moscow?

The Witness: Yes, I heard the decision. I was there when it was made.

By Mr. Levin:

Q. What did you hear? What was the decision made?

A. The decision was to reorganize—to purge the Communist Party of the United States of the Lovestone leadership and all its followers.

3144 Q. Was there any decision also made as to who was to take Lovestone's place, as leader of the Communist Party of the United States? A. Yes.

Q. Do you know what that decision was? A. Yes, the decision was that Foster—well, first it was decided that Foster was to be the General Secretary, and then that was changed to Browder.

Q. Browder was to be the General Secretary? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would you know where Earl Browder was at this time? A. He was in China.

Q. Was the decision to make him the leader of the Party arrived at while he was in China? A. Yes.

Q. Would you know whether or not he was then summoned to Moscow? A. That is right. He was summoned to Moscow, and he came to Moscow.

3145 Q. What was Browder doing in China? A.

3146 He was at the time a member of the Pan-Pacific Bureau of the Comintern, assigned to activities in China.

Q. Do you know a man by the name of Max Bedacht? A. I do.

Q. Who was he when you knew him? A. Max Bedacht was then a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States, and a member of the Political Bureau.

Q. Was he in Moscow at the time the decision was handed down regarding the factional dispute in the United States? A. Yes, he was.

Q. Was he assigned to any leadership position in the Party, as far as you know? A. Yes, he was made a member of the Secretariat, and was to replace the former Lovestone leadership.

Q. Do you know a man by the name of Robert Minor? A. Yes, I do.

Q. Do you know who he was in this period, 1928-1929? A. Yes, he was also a member of the Central Committee and the Political Bureau.

Q. Did he, as far as you know, receive any position in the Party as a result of the decision in the factional dispute in the United States? A. Yes, he was also made a member of the Secretariat to replace the former Lovestone leadership.

3147 Q. Before the decision was made, would you know whether Minor was a supporter of the Foster or the Lovestone faction? A. He was a supporter of the Lovestone faction.

Q. How about Bedacht? A. Bedacht was also a supporter of the Lovestone faction.

Q. How about Browder, would you know? A. Browder was a supporter of the Foster faction.

Q. Was Minor in the Soviet Union at the time this decision was handed out? A. No, he was not.

Q. Do you know where he was? A. He was back in the United States.

3169 Q. What did they tell you might happen if the Lovestone faction retained a majority of the membership in the Party? A. Well, amongst the things that it was decided to do, was to reorganize the Party completely, and if necessary create a new Party out of those that would accept the decision of the Communist International, and if necessary, to create a new daily paper from funds that Moscow would provide, and the same thing in reference to the Jewish daily paper of the Communist International.

That was in case they would not succeed to break down the Lovestone faction, and that said faction would retain control of the top machinery of the Communist Party in spite of the decision of the Communist International.

Q. Now I want to get you back to the United States again, Mr. Kornfedder. We will have to go back to the year 1921 or so.

In that period, around 1921, did you know a man by the name of John Pepper? A. Yes.

Q. Did you know him by any other name? A. Yes, Joseph Pogany.

Q. Did you know his nationality? A. Yes, he was a Hungarian.

Q. Do you know what he was doing in the United States?

A. He was here as a representative of the Communist International, at the beginning.

3170

Q. General representative? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now directing your attention to the period of the early 1920's, can you then state briefly the Trade Union policy of the Communist Party at that time? A. Well, at the very beginning the policy was in favor of supporting and infiltrating the IWW—that is the Industrial Workers of the World—but very early—and by that I refer to 1921—the policy was to infiltrate the American Federation of Labor and the Railroad Brotherhoods.

That line of policy continued until 1928.

By Mr. Lenvin:

Q. All right. Let's stop there.

Did you then know, at that time, let's say between 1921 and 1928, a man by the name of Scott? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who was he? A. Scott was a representative of the Red Labor Union International.

Q. What was that, the Red Labor Union International? A. The Red Labor Union International was a central body of Communist-controlled Labor Unions, on different continents. It functioned at the Trade Union Department of the Communist International.

Q. And whom did you say Scott was? You testified as to that. A. Scott represented the Red Labor Union International in the United States at that time.

3172 Q. Did you have occasion to speak to or confer with Scott about that time? A. Yes.

Q. In connection with your official duties as an official of the Communist Party? A. Yes, I did.

3173 Q. Why were you conferring, and holding these conversations, which you said you did, with Scott? A. I was then a member of the Central Committee in charge of the Communist Party's Labor Union activities, and I conferred with him because he represented the international central organization, the Red Labor Union International.

Q. Well, why would you— I still don't—all right.

Did you know of an organization known as the Trade Union Educational League? A. Yes.

Q. Do you know when it was first established? A. The Trade Union Educational League was first formed in 1921.

Q. Do you know who was responsible for the establishment of the Trade Union Educational League? A. The Communist Party, on instructions from the Communist International.

Q. Do you know how the Trade Union Educational League was financed? A. Yes.

3174 Q. How was it financed?

Mr. Abt: Let's find out how he knows, Mr. Chairman. This man does a lot of things, but we do not know how.

Mr. Lenvin: I don't mind asking him.

By Mr. Lenvin:

Q. How do you know? A. The initial setup was a subsidy—

Q. Just a minute, the question was, how do you know how the Trade Union Educational League was financed?

A. As a member of the Central Committee, as a result of my conversations with Scott, and his reports to the Central Committee, I know.

Q. Well, now, tell us how the Trade Union Educational League, then, was financed? A. It was financed in its initial stages by a subsidy of the Communist International.

Q. How do you know that? A. I know it because Jensen—

Q. Who? A. Well, that was his real name, Jensen.

3175 He went here under the name of Scott. Jensen came over with the amount for that purpose.

Q. Do you know how much the amount was? A. The appropriation was a hundred thousand dollars, and he came with half of that, fifty thousand dollars.

3176 Q. Mr. Kornfeder, while you were in Moscow, you stated that in addition to attending the Lenin Institute you were a member of the Anglo-American Secretariat.

Did you hold any other position in any other organization in Moscow? A. Yes, I was on the same type of Secretariat in the Labor Union International, known as the Profintern.

Q. And in such position, would you receive reports from the United States as to Labor Union activities? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now you stated, Mr. Kornfeder, that in 1921, the policy, the Trade Union policy, was infiltration, did you say? A. Yes, sir.

3177 Q. Infiltration of the Railroad Brotherhoods? A. Infiltration of the American Federation of Labor and the Railroad Brotherhoods.

Q. How long did that policy continue? A. Until 1928.

Q. Was there a change in that year? In policy, that is? A. There was a change in emphasis.

Q. Can you explain the change? A. The change was to concentrate the main forces of the Communist Party upon organizing outside of the American Federation of Labor, and especially in the large basic industries.

Q. Now in 1928 you were in Moscow? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that right? A. That is correct.

Q. And you just testified that you were a member of the Anglo-American Secretariat and of the Profintern? A. Yes.

Q. And in such positions, did you learn the reason for

Q. The reason for the change in policy about which you have just told us? A. Yes, the Communist International changed its policy at that time on a world-wide scale, and that applied also to the United States.

In the United States there was a special reason in the fact that the large and basic industries had never been organized, and the Communist International was always impressed with organizing those industries.

So when the change of general policy came about, in its application to the United States, it meant to concentrate all forces, or most of the forces, in organizing the big industries.

Q. You testified that this was then a change in policy in the Trade Union activities of the Communist Party, is that right? A. Yes, sir.

Q. As a member of the Anglo-American Secretariat of the Profintern, were you in communication with leaders of the Communist Party in the United States? A. Yes.

Q. This change of policy, was that communicated by you to anyone in the United States? A. That was communicated, through the Profintern, and the Comintern, to the United States, yes, sir.

Q. How do you know? A. Well, I saw the instructions before they went out.

Q. Now this organization that you talked about, Trade Union Educational League, is that still in existence? A. No.

Q. When did it go out of existence, if you know? A. The Trade Union Educational League went out of existence in 1928.

Q. Did you have anything to do with the demise of the organization? A. Yes, I was in favor of its demise. And whatever I could do, in Moscow, I did.

Q. Was there any organization established to substitute or take the place of the Trade Union Educational League? A. Yes.

Q. What was the name of that organization? A. The name of the new organization was the Trade Union Unity League.

Q. What is the difference between the two, if any? A. The difference between the two is that the Trade Union Educational League operated only inside of established unions—either the American Federation of Labor or the Railroad Brotherhoods—and was not a dues-paying organization.

It was supposed to educate the members of these unions, from the inside, in favor of communist policies.

The Trade Union Unity League was set up as a rival federation to organize new unions in large industry in unorganized industry, to set them up as local unions in 3180 great national bodies, to collect dues, call strikes on their own initiative, and so on.

Q. Now before I go any further, Mr. Kornfeder, I would like to know if you had occasion to learn anything regarding the organization setup of the Red International of Labor Unions? A. Yes.

3182 Q. Now, you have previously testified that there was a change in trade union policy of the Communist Party instituted in 1928.

How long did that policy which you described as being instituted then continue? A. Till about 1934.

Q. And was there a change in that year? A. Yes.

Q. Can you describe the change? A. The change was again a part of an international change of policy, which had its effects on the United States—the so-called popular front.

So the change in the trade union field was to reemphasize, again, activity inside the American Federation of Labor and the railroad brotherhoods.

Q. How did you personally become aware of these shifts or changes in policy? Trade union policy, that is.

Mr. Levin: Let me withdraw that question.

By Mr. Levin:

3183 Q. This change that you mention as occurring in 1933 or 1934, rather, how did you become aware of that change? A. I became aware of it by pressure on me from the Central Committee to shift the active forces in a somewhat different direction, of giving more time to infiltration in the A. F. L. unions, and of assigning some of the active forces there, and so on.

Q. Did you have any conversations with anyone regarding these shifts or changes in trade union policy? A. Yes, the first thorough conversation I had on it was with Gerhardt Eisler.

Q. When was that? A. That was in 1933.

Q. Who was Gerhardt Eisler? A. Gerhardt Eisler was then the representative of the Communist International in the United States.

Q. Where did you have this conversation with him? A. In Cleveland, Ohio.

Q. Did you have occasion to discuss this change in policy with any leaders of the Communist Party in the United States? A. Yes, I discussed it also with Bill Dunn, with Earl Browder, and Foster.

Q. Where did you discuss this matter with Earl 3184 Browder? And when? A. I think I discussed the matter with Browder at a large meeting of the Central Committee in New York, also in 1933, I believe.

Q. Were you on friendly terms with Earl Browder at that time, in 1933? A. Oh, yes, we were close political friends for a long time.

3185 Q. Now, coming back to your testimony that you had a conversation with Gerhardt Eisler, in Cleveland, in 1933, what was the substance of that conversation, do you remember? A. Well, there were several items that were the subject of the conversation. One I already men-

tioned, of more emphasis upon infiltration into the American Federation of Labor, and another was that he wanted at the same time much more activity in the basic industries in Ohio, specifically he wanted me to call a strike at the Fisher Body Plant, in Cleveland, and I said it was impossible. There wasn't enough organization.

"I insisted that a mass meeting be called. He claimed that all the American leaders underestimated the willingness of the American workers to fight. So, since he was the top boss, I called the meeting, and the meeting turned 3186 out just as I told him. It flopped.

Q. Was that the first time you ever met Gerhardt Eisler? A. No, I had met him before, in Moscow.

Q. When? A. I believe in 1928 or 1929.

Q. Do you know what he was doing in Moscow then? A. He was in Moscow then as part of a delegation from the German Communist Party.

Q. Now, you have said that he was the Communist International representative in the United States. How do you know he was the Communist International representative in the United States? A. Well, he told me so himself, plus I knew of it before he came there.

Q. How did you know that? A. Oh, by members of the Central Committee passing through Cleveland and stopping there.

3190 Q. Was there a national convention of the Communist Party held in Cleveland in 1934? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you attend that convention? A. Yes, I was a delegate.

Q. Did you speak at that convention? A. I did.

Q. What was the subject of your talk? A. The subject was my disagreement with the new switch of policy which then was being effected.

Q. Is there any procedure whereby a person indicates his desire to make a speech, on the convention floor, at a convention of the Communist Party? A. Yes.

Q. What is the procedure? A. You ask the Presidium of the convention, specifically the chairman, for time to speak.

Q. Did you adopt that procedure before you spoke at the convention in Cleveland, in 1934? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there any objection raised to your speaking? A. Yes. Gerhardt Eisler, who sat right there in the convention of course, only those that knew who he was knew that he was there—warned me against speaking. He said 3191 if I voice disagreement, it will have very serious consequences for me.

Q. Did you understand what he meant by that term "serious consequences"? A. Yes, I think I did.

Q. What did you understand that he meant by it? A. I understood by that that I may be removed from all positions in the Party, and possibly expelled.

Q. You got that warning, and despite that warning did you speak on the convention floor? A. I insisted on speaking, yes.

Q. Do you recall the substance of the talk that you made on the convention floor at that time, in 1934. A. In a general way. I indicated my disagreement with the new switch of policy, specifically in the labor union field. My opinion was that in the United States, where most of the big industries were unorganized, the emphasis in organizing these industries into unions outside of the American Federation of Labor should be continued.

Q. Did anyone speak after you at this convention, on the same subject? A. Yes, indeed.

Q. In agreement with you? A. No. All the members of the Political Bureau, and many others, after that, 3192 kept on a barrage against me and what I said, including what I hadn't said which was sort of a verbal political lynching of me after that.

Q. Were there any consequences flowing from your speech on the convention floor? A. Yes.

Q. What was it? A. A member of the Central Committee, by name of Jack Johnstone, came to me in the name

of the Political Bureau and in the name of Gerhardt Eisler, and said that if I do not make a statement to be published in the Party press repudiating my views, and endorsing the new switch in party policy, I will be removed from all positions, I won't be able to engage in any activities without permission of the Political Bureau, and they give me sixty days to do that, and if I don't, I will be expelled.

Q. Now, after that conversation or communication with Johnstone, did you remain in Cleveland? A. I remained in Cleveland a few weeks, and then I returned to New York.

Mr. LaFollette: I would like to have the time of the convention and the time of this conversation fixed, if you can.

By Mr. Lenvin:

Q. Do you recall the month of the year in 1934 in 3193 which the convention was held? A. I think the convention was in April, 1934.

Mr. LaFollette: April of 1934, is that right?

Mr. Lenvin: That is correct.

By Mr. Lenvin:

Q. And how long thereafter did you have this conversation with Johnstone that you referred to? A. Immediately after the adjournment of the convention.

Q. Now, do you know when that was? How long did the convention last? A. The convention, I think, lasted a week or ten days.

Q. You say from Cleveland you went to New York. About when was that? A. That was about three or four weeks after the adjournment of the convention.

Q. Did you have occasion to meet with Eisler again in New York? A. Yes.

Q. When? Do you recall? A. I think the last time I met him was in July.

Q. Of 1934? A. Of 1934.

Q. Did you have a conversation with him at that time?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall the substance of your conversation with Eisler then? A. The conversation related to the text of the statement I was supposed to make for publication, repudiating my views, and endorsing the views of the Political Bureau of the Party.

Q. How many times did you meet with Eisler, in New York, in July of 1934? A. I believe twice.

Q. Can you recall where these meetings were held? A. One was held in a park, on the lower west side of New York—I don't recall the name of the park—and the other one was held, I believe, in Foster's apartment in the Bronx.

Q. At which meeting did you discuss the statement which you were supposed to make? The meeting in the park or the meeting in Foster's apartment? A. At both.

Q. Which came first? A. At both.

Q. Which meeting came first, the one in the park or the one in Foster's apartment? A. The one in Foster's apartment. I may be mistaken and that meeting was at somebody else's apartment, I don't recall. But one was on the inside, and the other one was in a park.

Q. You discussed, you say, the text of your statement. Did Eisler agree on the text of your statement? A. No.

Q. Then what happened? A. Well, there was one more effort to make me agree to the text of a statement by Foster, at Foster's apartment, and since no agreement was reached, I subsequently turned in my Party book, together with a number of others that quit at the same time with me, and the next thing I saw was about a half-page statement in the Daily Worker expelling me and several others.

Q. From the Party? A. From the Party.

Q. Mr. Kornfeder, do you know an Alexander Trachtenburg? A. I do.

Q. Do you know what position he held during the period of your membership in the Communist Party? A. He was the head of a publishing outfit known as International Publishers.

Q. Do you know how he obtained that position? A. Yes.

Q. Will you tell us how?

Mr. Abt: We ought to have how he knows, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lenvin: I don't mind asking him that question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LaFollette: All right.

By Mr. Lenvin:

Q. How do you know how he obtained the position with International Publishers? A. I know it from Moscow. He was made the representative of the Soviet publishing establishment, which had branches in various countries, and in this country it was known as the International Publishers. The decision as to who that should be was made from Moscow in consultation with the Political Bureau in the United States.

Q. While you were a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, did you ever learn anything about the operation and finances of International Publishers, Inc.? A. I don't recall anything while I was in the United States.

Q. Then did you learn anything regarding its operation and finances while you were in Moscow?
3199 A. Yes.

Q. What did you learn? A. That the deficits of the International Publishers—

Q. That the what—I am sorry, I didn't hear you. A. That the deficits of International Publishers were made good by the Soviet Publishing House.

Q. Either while a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party or while you were in Moscow, did you learn anything regarding the operation and function of the Workers Library Publishing Company? A. Yes.

Q. What did you learn? A. Workers Library Publishers was a pseudonym for the agitation and propaganda department of the Communist Party.

Q. Was it a self-sustaining operation? A. Yes, it was a Party operation entirely.

Q. Financed wholly by the sale of its publications? A. It was partly financed by the sale, and mostly by the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

Q. What is the distinction, if any, between the International Publishers Company and the Workers Library Publishing Company? A. Well, the main distinction is that the International Publishers publishes the more substantial books used in the communist movement, like the works of Lenin, Stalin, and others, for the theoretical education of the Party members and sympathizers; and the Workers Library Publishers publishes the smaller stuff, small pamphlets; a nickle, a dime, or thereabouts, in order to reach the strata that would not read heavy literature.

3204 Q. Did you learn of any subsidies for special activities coming from Moscow, during your attendance at any Central Committee meetings of the Communist Party? A. No, those subsidies would not be reported at Central Committee meetings.

Q. Now, you did testify that the Party was financed, in part at least, by subsidies from Moscow? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that correct? A. Yes.

Q. Now I ask you, where did you get that information? A. Well, I have the information as to the subsidies from my membership in the Anglo-American Secretariat of the Communist International, and of the Profintern, and from attending meetings of the Secretariat of the Communist International, and the appropriation commission of the International, when it dealt with American affairs, and from the organization department of the Communist International, and the agitation and propaganda department of the Communist International, each of which at one time or another had as a subject, recommendation as to subsidizing

certain activities which then would be cleared by the commission which made the final authorization on it.

I was privileged to attend some of these, because I was recognized in the Communist International, as the representative of a faction in the Party which was in favor, at the time, in Moscow. That is how I happen to know about subsidies for the Daily Worker, for activities amongst
 3206 the railroads, for activities in the maritime field, and various other fields.

Q. In relation to your answer as to subsidization for special activities, Mr. Kornfeder, did you learn, either while you were a member of the Central Committee, or while you were attending the Central Committee meetings, or while you were in Moscow, whether there ever was a subsidy for the Daily Worker? A. Yes.

3207 Q. Do you know the amount?

3208 The Witness: The subsidy in 1929 was 30 per cent of the Daily Worker's cost of publication and distribution.

By Mr. Lénvin:

Q. Do you know of a publication known as the "Jewish Freiheit?" A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you know about that publication? A. Well, it is a daily Jewish paper of the Communist Party.

Q. Do you know whether that paper ever received any subsidy from the Communist International? A. Yes.

3210 Q. How do you know that a subsidy was received by the Jewish Freiheit?

Mr. LaFollette: At the time of its foundation, I think was his testimony.

The Witness: Yes. The subsidies received by the Freiheit at the time of its foundation, I knew at the time it was

received because at one time, in the very early stages, subsidies from Moscow were reported. At that time the Central Committee was a very small one.

Later on they were not reported.

The subsidy about the Freiheit I know specifically from Alexander Bittelman, and when I did get to Moscow, my knowledge about it was confirmed there from additional information.

3211 Mr. LaFollette: From what information?

The Witness: About the subsidy.

Mr. LaFollette: Yes, was confirmed by what information?

The Witness: Was confirmed by information in the Communist International.

Mr. LaFollette: I see. Was that information, information in writing that you saw, or how did that confirming information come to you?

The Witness: No, it comes from those that handled the assignment of subsidies for various activities in the Communist Party in the United States.

Losovsky knew about it.

Q. Did you ever have a conversation regarding the subsidy either to the Daily Worker or to the Freiheit with leaders of the Communist Party?

3212 The Witness: As to the Freiheit, I only know the subsidy at the very beginning. I don't recall anything past that.

As to the Daily Worker, I know the Daily Worker was subsidized continuously, since its foundation. I know it from Moscow, I know it from Browder, I know it

3213 from Foster—the Daily Worker would have been out of business a long time ago without the subsidies from Moscow.

Mr. LaFollette: And this is during the period of your membership in the Party? Is that the extent of this information?

The Witness: Yes.

3220 Q. Mr. Kornfeder, on Thursday, you had been mentioning several times "Comintern" and "Communist International."

Will you tell the Panel just what is the Communist International?

3221 A. The Communist International is the worldwide organization of all the Communist Parties in various countries. Its headquarters are located in Moscow.

Q. When you were in Moscow during the years 1927 to 1930, did you learn anything regarding the organizational set-up of the Communist International? A. Oh, yes.

Q. Will you tell us the organizational set-up of the Communist International? A. The organization set-up is providing various departments, secretariats, bureaux and commissions. There are certain basic departments like organization department, agitation and propaganda department, youth department.

These departments have interlinked with corresponding departments in the various communist parties.

Then there is secretariats. The secretariats are to supervise the policies of the various communist parties; for instance, there is an Anglo-American Secretariat, a Latin-American Secretariat, a Far East Secretariat, and

3222 West European Secretariat, and so on.

Then there are field bureaux outside of Moscow which directly interlink with the Moscow headquarters, such as the Caribbean bureau of the Comintern, the Pan-Pacific bureau of the Comintern, the South American bureau of the Comintern: These bureaux direct the Communist Parties on a continental or semi-continental scale.

This, in the main, is the inner structure of the Communist International headquarters in Moscow. This is where departments and bureaux have jurisdiction over the same de-

partments from the various Communist Parties. That is, the organization department of the Communist International designs the organization strategy and its tactics for the Communist Parties and transmits them through the organization department, let's say, of the Communist Party of the United States.

* The same with the agitation, propaganda department and the other departments. There is the activities specialized along certain fields.

That, in brief, would explain the internal set-up.

Q. You mentioned several of what you called "field bureaus." You mentioned several geographical areas of field bureaus.

Is there a North American field bureau of the Communist International?

3223 Q. When you learned of the international set-up of the Communist International, was there a North American Bureau, similar to the South American Bureau, the Latin-American Bureau, one of that type? A. No, there was no North American Bureau, but the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of the United States for a time acted in that capacity.

Q. For what parties? A. For the parties in Canada, Cuba, Mexico and smaller groups down to the Panama Canal.

Q. Were you ever in the building which houses the Communist International? A. Yes, I was there many times.

Q. How large a building would you say it was? A. Oh, it was the size of the old State Department Building here in Washington.

Q. About how many employees, would you say, were working in that building? A. About 1200.

3224 Q. Were you ever taken on tours through the building houses of the Communist International?

A. Oh, yes.

Q. By whom? A. Well, I had the standing pass of entry and went through the floors many times on business. I was also shown through it by the head of the Anglo-American Secretariat.

Q. Did you ever talk with any of the leaders of the Communist International regarding their finance? A. Yes.

Q. From those conversations, did you learn how the Communist International was financed? A. Yes, I did.

3225 Q. How was the Communist International financed? A. The Communist International was financed in two ways: One, by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, that is as far as disbursements in rubles were concerned; and by the Soviet Government as far as foreign currency payment of subsidies were concerned.

Q. During the years that you were in Moscow, did you continue your membership in the Party in the United States? A. No. I was transferred into, after six months, into membership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Q. Were there any special assessments made upon you as a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? A. Yes. There was a Communist International assessment that the members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had to pay.

Q. You stated earlier that the Communist International employed approximately so many hundreds of people. How were these people paid, by whom? A. The employees in the building were paid through the organization department of the Communist International, who handled the finances. That is where they got their weekly pay in rubles:

Those that worked for the Communist International outside had to be paid in foreign currency, either dollars, sterling, marks or francs, and they were paid
3226 usually through the various field bureaus of the Communist International.

Q. During your stay in Moscow, Mr. Kornfeder, did you pay your own expenses? A. No.

Q. How did you support yourself while you were in Moscow? A. Well, the Lenin School provided all the necessities as far as accommodations, food, dormitories, and so on, plus each trainee got 54 rubles a month for incidental expenses.

Mr. Lenvin: Now, I apologize to the Panel, but we find it necessary to go back to about 1919 because the Attorney General wishes to make clear to the Panel and on the record the various steps leading to the emergence of the Communist Party.

Mr. LaFollette: I want to clear up something before you go back to that period.

I think you answered Mr. Lenvin that for a period of time during which you were in the Party, the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of the United States served as the North American Bureau. Can you tell me as definitely as you can, what was that period of time in years?

The Witness: From the early 20's, about 1921, until 1932.

Mr. LaFollette: Thank you.

Mr. Lenvin: May I ask one other question in regard to that, please, Mr. Chairman?

3227 Mr. LaFollette: Yes.

By Mr. Lenvin:

Q. What happened after 1932? A. Well, there was set up a Caribbean bureau of the Comintern, which took over the supervision of all the countries south of the Rio Grande down to the Panama Canal and the Canadian Communist Party before that became autonomists of the American Communist Party and was under direct supervision from the Moscow headquarters and the Anglo-American Secretariat of the Communist International.

3246 Q. Mr. Kornfeder, during your years of membership in the Communist Party, what use was made of this document in the Communist Party?

3247 Mr. LaFollette: This is Exhibit 8 now?

Mr. Lenvin: This is Exhibit 8.

The Witness: This was a basic document, to which references were made very often and we were told in the Central Committee that Lenin, himself, had made the draft for this document, at the Second Congress.

It was used continuously and was available to the membership in the Communist Party for quotations, references and so on.

By Mr. Lenvin:

Q. It was considered an important document? A. Yes.

Mr. LaFollette: By whom were you told these facts which you related while you were in this position in the Party?

The Witness: By the then delegate who had returned from the Second Congress, which was Louis Fraina.

3250 Q. What was the status of the Communist Party
3251 in 1921 after its convention at which it adopted that
name? A. In 1921 the Communist Party was still
the underground organization.

Q. What do you mean by an underground organization?
A. Well, the Party did not function in the open. It carried on its business in secret meetings. We did not have any open headquarters. It did not publish its official organ for free distribution in public and so on and so forth.

Q. How long did it continue as an underground organization? A. It continued as an underground organization until, oh, about the end of 1922.

Q. Mr. Kornfeder, did you ever know of an organization known as the Worker's Party? A. Yes, I did.

3252 Q. When was it formed? A. The Workers Party was formed at a convention held in New York towards the end of 1921.

Q. Were you present at that Convention? A. Yes. I was a delegate.

Q. Will you tell the Panel the background and circumstances leading up to the formation of the Workers Party?

A. The Workers Party was formed as a result of instructions from the Communist International, ordering the Party to emerge into the open. In the letter addressed by the Communist International to the Party, at the time it was pointed out that in the Communist International the Party could carry on its activities in public and it is not necessary to continue to function as a strictly underground organization in this country. So as a result of that, this convention which led to the formation of the Worker's Party was organized.

* * * * *

3253 Q. Mr. Kornfeder, did the two parties exist side by side? A. Yes, they did.

Q. How were they distinguished? A. The underground Party, who controls the legal Party, was called No. 1 in Party language and the open Party was called No. 2. It was thus referred to in all communications and references of the underground Communists and on other occasions.

Q. How long did this state of affairs continue? A. It continued until the end of 1922 or the early part of 1923.

Q. What happened then? A. Then the No. 1, the underground, by instructions by the Communist International, was completely liquidated as a Party and only what they called an underground apparatus remained, not the Party.

Q. Did the Workers Party continue in existence?

3254 A. The Workers Party then became the Communist Party.

Q. What was its title? A. At the first convention in 1921 it was called the Workers Party. Then at a subsequent convention a few years later the name was slightly changed by putting the word "Communist" in brackets between "Workers" and "Party" so that it read "Workers [Communist] Party."

Q. How long did that continue, the name of "Workers [Communist] Party?" A. That continued, I believe, until 1925.

Q. What happened then? A. Then the word "Workers" was dropped and it became the Communist Party.

* * * * *

3262 Q. During your membership in the Communist Party, were you required to read the Daily Worker, The Communist, and other official papers of the Communist Party? A. Yes.

3265 Q. You have testified previously that the Communist Party has from time to time received certain instructions and directions from the Communist International.

Now, I ask you, do you know of any instance when the Communist Party ever deviated from or refused to comply with such direction?

3266 The Witness: I know of no instance where the Communist Party deviated from the instructions of the Communist International and those instances where there was a tendency to deviate, in each case, the leaders of the Communist Party here were either expelled or removed from leadership.

3279 Q. Mr. Kornfeder, during your stay in Moscow, did you come to know who were the leaders or the heads of the Communist International? A. Yes, I did.

Q. Will you state it, please? A. Well, the first head of the Communist International was Nikoli Lenin.

Mr. Abt: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. If we are going to have this, let's have it by dates. I don't know whether the witness is talking about when he was there, before he was there, or after he was there, or what.

Mr. LaFollette: I think it would be better as you testify as to who were the heads, if you identify the period to which you are referring. Proceed.

The Witness: Nikoli Lenin was the head of the Communist International beginning with 1919 and 1920.

3280 He was followed by Gregory Zinoviev.

This was from 1920 to 1924, and then Nikoli Bukharin, that was from 1924 to 1928, and from 1929 to the time I left, it was Molotov.

By Mr. Levin:

Q. Did Lenin, at the time he was head of the Communist International, hold any position within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? A. Yes, he was the head of the Political Bureau and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Q. Did Zinoviev, when he was head of the Communist International, hold any position in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? A. Yes, he was a member of the Central Committee, and Molotov was head of the Politburo of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Q. When Bukharin was head of the Communist International, did he hold a position in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? A. Yes, he was also a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Political Bureau of the same party.

Q. When Molotov was head of the Communist International, did he hold any position in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? A. Yes. Molotov was, also, a member of the Political Bureau and the Central Committee
3281 of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Q. What was the relationship of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, if any, to the Communist International? A. The relationship of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Communist International was one of a leading party. That is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was recognized as the leading party in the Communist International. None of the affairs of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union were ever considered for decision by any of the bodies of the Communist International.

Its affairs did not come for determination before
3282 any of the departments of the Communist International except such as the Politburo of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union may care of its own will

to submit for endorsement to the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

That was the special relation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union within the Communist International. It was the leader of it, not subject to the Communist International orders or discipline.

Q. Was there any other Communist Party in the world, as far as you know, that would hold a similar position or have similar status as the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? A. No.

Q. Did you know a man by the name of Manuilsky? A. Yes, I do, indeed.

Q. Who was he? A. Manuilsky was the Secretary of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and the representative of the Politburo of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

Q. Do you know what position he holds today? A. Yes.

3285. Q. Mr. Kornfeder, when you were a member of the Communist Party, did you know Jack—sometimes I think you used the name Jacob Stachel? A. Yes, I do indeed.

Q. Was he a member of the Party when you were 3286 in the Party? A. He was a member of the Party and a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

Q. And when you were in the Communist Party, did you know William Foster? A. Yes, I did. He is now Chairman of the Communist Party.

Q. Do you know what position he held approximately during the 1930's?

Mr. Abt: Just a moment. What period are you asking about?

Mr. Levin: In the early 1930's during his membership.

Mr. Abt: Prior to 1934?

Mr. Levin: Yes.

The Witness: He was a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and its Politburo and in charge of the Communist Party's Labor Union activities nationally.

By Mr. Lénvin:

Q. Was he ever in Moscow? A. Yes, he was.

Q. Did you know Alexander Bittelman? A. Yes, I know Alexander Bittelman.

Q. Was he ever in Moscow? A. Yes, he was in Moscow. I met him there.

Q. Can you tell me what positions, if any, he may
3287 have held within the Communist Party during the period from 1930 to 1934? A. He was a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and a member of the Politburo.

Q. Do you know a man by the name of Williamson? A. John E. Williamson? Yes, I know him.

Q. Who was he during that period, 1930 to 1934? A. I became acquainted with him mostly when he was District Organizer of the Communist Party in Ohio.

Q. Was that during the time that you have testified that you were in Ohio as an official of the Communist Party? A. That is right.

Q. Do you know Carl Winter? A. Yes, I know Carl Winter.

Q. Did you know him in the years 1930-1934? A. Yes, I did.

Q. Do you know what position he held within the Communist Party, if any? A. He was one of the leading members of the Party. What position he exactly held then, I don't recall at this moment.

Q. Do you know John Gates? A. Yes, I know John Gates.

Q. Do you know what position, if any, he held within
3288 the Party during the years 1930-1934? A. He was a leading member of the Communist Party and formerly a leader of the Young Communist League.

Q. Do you know Irving Potash? A. Yes, I know Irving Potash.

Q. Do you know what position he held in the Communist Party during the course of your membership? A. Yes. He was at that time a member of the District Committee of the Communist Party in the York District and one of the leaders of Communist Parties working in Labor Unions.

Q. Did he ever go to Moscow? A. Yes.

Q. How do you know? A. I arranged for him going there.

Q. Do you know Gus Hall? A. I know Gus Hall as a Party member. I don't recall what office he held at the time.

Q. Do you know Henry Winston? A. No, I don't think so.

Q. Do you know Claudia Jones? A. Yes.

Q. Will you tell us who she was? A. She was a Party member engaged in activities amongst the Negroes.

Q. Do you know Claude Lightfoot? A. Yes, I know Claude Lightfoot.

3289 He was in the Lenin School at the same time as I was.

Q. I am sorry, I didn't get the last of your reply. A. He was in the Lenin School at the same time as I was.

Q. Did you know Bill Schneiderman? A. Yes, I know Bill Schneiderman.

Q. Who was he? A. He was a member of the Party. What office he held at the time, I don't recall.

3290 Cross examination.

3428 Mr. LaFollette: Will you ask him the question again, and it will be very helpful to me, Mr. Witness, if you will just answer the question:

The Witness: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if this individual asks me—

Mr. LaFollette: Will you keep still?

The Witness: Well, I can't.

Mr. LaFollette: Will you answer the question that is asked you? Please ask him the question.

The Witness: I can't answer when I am bludgeoned.

Mr. Lenvin: May I address some remarks to the witness?

Mr. LaFollette: I wish you would take him out and admonish him.

3429 The Witness: I will not reappear here again.

Mr. LaFollette: That is very interesting. I find myself in the position where I am not sure that I can do anything about a contumacious witness. I am entitled to do something about a contumacious counsel. I am not even sure of just what support I would get.

Mr. Paisley: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LaFollette: I am not charging you. Go ahead.

Mr. Paisley: May I suggest a recess, a cooling off period?

Mr. LaFollette: I think it would be an excellent time to have a cooling off period at which time, perhaps, some explanation would be given to this witness that he is to answer questions and it is the province of this Panel to determine what implication is to be put on them.

Mr. Lenvin: Mr. Chairman, the witness has asked me to state that he did not intend any discourtesy towards the Chairman in his answer, but that his feelings had been excited and exasperated by the charges made by counsel for the Respondent as to his having committed certain crimes, but he did not intend any discourtesy to the Chairman.

Mr. LaFollette: Mr. Witness, the statement made through your counsel is accepted.

3442 Mr. LaFollette: I think that objection is a proper one. He can get right down to it and ask him how much money he has made by testifying for the Government. That is about as far as it goes.

There is another matter, before I hear these legal arguments.

Mr. Kornfeder, I want to say to you again that you are a witness in this proceeding, not a lawyer. You asked me something. I am considering whether or not your request will be made. I have no objection to that. I do not consider it orderly or proper or within the province of
3443 a witness to address himself to opposing counsel and I am admonishing you again for doing it and I want the record to show that at this time, when this occasion occurred, Mr. Marcantonio, Counsel for Respondent, was addressing the Panel in an ordinary tone of voice, was addressing no remarks to counsel, and there is no occasion whatsoever or an excuse to be offered for this continued injection by the witness of his own arguments with Counsel and if we cannot proceed without this, either the Presiding Member of this Panel is going to retire or the witness is going to retire.

The Witness: I am quite willing.

Mr. LaFollette: I shall ask the Board to authorize me, on that remark, to request a citation of contempt of this witness, unless there is an apology made within two minutes by him personally, not through Counsel. It is now one minute after 12 o'clock.

The Witness: If you tell me why I should make an apology, I will make one.

* * * * *

3444 Mr. Paisley: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this, that I am satisfied that the witness meant no disrespect to this Panel. I think he has been provoked and aggravated, but I am sure he meant no disrespect to this Panel.

* * * * *

3446 Mr. LaFollette: I am going to make a statement. Any member of the Panel, when I have finished, is free to register his dissent and is requested to do so for the record.

It is my opinion that we cannot conduct an orderly hearing in this case unless a witness obeys implicitly the direction of the Presiding Member of the Panel; that this includes a continuation, by any witness, of conduct which is contrary to that about which he has been admonished by the Presiding Member of this Panel, on behalf of the Panel; that it is my opinion that the conduct of this witness, after we reconvened this morning and after an apology had been stated for him through his counsel and had been accepted, evidenced a determination on the part of this witness to continue the conduct about which he had been admonished and about which unquestionably he had been admonished by his counsel.

That question of whether this Panel may have available to it processes necessary to obtain a citation for contempt is a matter for the Board to determine. That issue 3447 is not now before us.

It is my opinion that the Board has the power, in the case of continued conduct which clearly disrupts the orderly conduct of the hearing, which violates an admonition of the Presiding Member of the Panel not to repeat certain conduct, which has the effect of preventing and disturbing an orderly conduct of these proceedings as the Presiding Member of the Panel construes such proper conduct to be, to authorize this Panel, in the case of this witness from now on or any other witness who may appear for the Petitioner or the Respondent and request the witness, to request that the witness be removed from the hearing room by the marshal and to order the testimony of that witness stricken from the record.

We will leave it the responsibility of Counsel to control the conduct of their witnesses. If the Panel so acts and does so order the testimony stricken, the right will be reserved to the Party, as to which the witness has testified against, and as to which his testimony has been stricken, to petition the Panel for the right to permit the witness to again return to the witness stand and for a reversal of

the Panel's ruling that the witness' testimony shall be stricken from the record.

That is all I have to say. If any other member of the Panel would like to dictate a record, he may do so.

Miss McHale: I concur with that statement.

3448 Mr. Brown: Of course, I agree that orderly procedure must be maintained in the hearing room at all times, however, having considered this matter in the light of all the circumstances surrounding the incidents to which Mr. LaFollette refers, I am not able to share the views which he has expressed with regard to the conduct of this witness.

3483 Mr. LaFollette: With reference to the written material submitted to the Presiding Member of the Panel by Mr. Abt on behalf of the Respondents with reference to the positions held by Mr. Manuilsky, this material, if you wish, Mr. Abt, may be marked for identification at this time.

The offer at this time will be rejected.

Out of deference to the admonition given to the Presiding Officer of the Panel by Mr. Paisley yesterday, I will not say anything about the reasons for it.

(The document referred to was marked for identification Respondent's Exhibit CP 6).

Mr. Abt: I think we are entitled to know the grounds.

Mr. LaFollette: I am very sorry. I think I must confine myself to conduct which is pleasing to the Petitioner's counsel and which is concurred in by a member of the Panel, Mr. Brown.

Mr. Abt: I would simply like the record to show, Mr. Chairman, that the failure of the Panel to state the ground on which it is rejecting the offer places the Respondent in quite an impossible position. We don't know whether the

3484 Panel is rejecting the offer on the grounds that no foundation has been laid to show and establish the authenticity of the information submitted.

If that is the ground for its rejection, then we will simply have to use our ingenuity to find ways of authenticating it.

If there is some other ground of objection that can be cured by establishing the authenticity of the information, then if we believe it is important to put this matter in evidence, and we do, we will have to find some other way of doing it, but we would be playing a guessing game here unless there is at least a brief statement of the grounds on which the offer is being rejected.

Mr. LaFollette: I have nothing more to say, Mr. Abt.

3486 * I have also reached a conclusion with reference to my role in these proceedings.

I have reviewed the record of yesterday and I recall vividly the facts which occurred in the hearing room yesterday, particularly yesterday afternoon, from which I have reached the conclusion that while it is a matter which does not rise to the dignity of contempt, there is very evidently a disdain for the Presiding Member of this Panel and his method of conducting this case on behalf of the Chief Counsel for the Petitioners, which quite evidently is being transmitted to the Petitioner's witnesses.

Much has been written about the difficulty of Judge Medina in conducting an orderly hearing. It must be remembered that factual action of witnesses there which was judged to be contumacious and of counsel was by people on behalf of whom there was no public opinion or public support.

In this proceeding, also factually, we recognize, or I do, that there is great public support for anything which the petitioner here proposes, which makes it impossible for me, notwithstanding the stalwart support which I received from my colleague, Dr. McHale, yesterday, to feel that I can conduct these hearings in a way which will be consistent with orderly procedure.

I do not believe that I will be able to exercise any control over any witnesses submitted by the petitioner and

3487 I think if I cease to exercise the prerogatives of presiding we will have a much more orderly process and there will be no delays by any statements made by the Presiding Officer, which seems to be so offensive.

Also, we will have a speedier hearing, I am sure, because the Panel Member, Mr. Brown, whom I have asked to preside from now on, has already evidenced the remarkable capacity to make speedy and immediate rulings upon all objections presented to this Panel.

The fact that they almost uniformly amount to a sustaining of any position taken by the Petitioner and a rejection of any position taken by the Respondent is purely coincidental, I am sure.

However, I cannot continue to preside in the face of the position, sustained by Petitioner's witnesses, of Petitioner's Chief Counsel, and the obvious concurrences in that position of the member of the Panel who sits on my right, Mr. Brown.

Therefore, I announce that from now on, I will not announce any rulings of the Panel and I request Mr. Brown to take this place.

If he desires to conduct the hearings from the position he now occupies, he may do so.

* * * * *

3496 Mr. Abt: Mr. Chairman, there are two preliminary matters which we would like to present before we proceed with cross examination.

First, I would like to call the Panel's attention to the fact that as appears now from the record, and particularly the record of the proceedings on May 24, the last sitting of the Panel, the Panel now sits without a chairman, as far as the record is concerned.

Mr. LaFollette: I will dispose of that now Mr. Abt. I will read into the record the following memorandum dated June 1, 1951, Memorandum to Hearing Panel—

"The original hearing Panel, designation dated April 3, 1951, naming Members LaFollette, Brown and McHale as

the Panel selected to conduct the current Communist Party hearing, is continued in full force and effect, and such Panel is requested to continue to conduct the current hearing referred to, with Member LaFollette continuing to act as the presiding member of the Panel." Signed, Seth Richardson, Chairman.

* * * * *

3498 Mr. Marcantonio: I object to any further proceedings in this matter and I base my objection on the language contained on page 1793, by the Chairman of the Panel, 1793 of the hearings, transcript of the hearings, dated May 24, 1951.

Mr. LaFollette: The objection is overruled. You may proceed with your cross examination.

* * * * *

3543 Q. Did you discuss with him what you were going to say here? A. No. I know Mandel for thirty years. He knows what I know. We don't need to discuss it.

Q. Did you discuss the nature of the Panel before 3544 whom you were appearing? A. I asked—

Mr. LaFollette: I am going to deny that and grant your objection. I don't believe the chair was correct in interrogating Mr. Gitlow on that question. I have done it. I don't retract from that interrogation. But I don't believe we need to continue it. I will stand on that.

* * * * *

3545 Q. When was the last time that you saw Mr. Mandel? A. The day when this hearing was adjourned, before I left for Detroit.

Q. You went from here to Mr. Mandel's office, or did you phone him first? That was on May 24 when we adjourned, correct? A. Yes.

Q. What did you do, call him up? A. I met him at the cafeteria at the House Building.

Q. Was that by accident or pre-arrangement? A. No, we usually eat there.

Q. Did you have an appointment with him? A. Yes, I called him up.

Q. When did you call him? A. Oh, shortly after this hearing adjourned.

Q. So that you phoned him right after the chairman announced the adjournment until June 4, isn't that correct? A. Yes.

Q. You went to a telephone booth outside here and you made a call, isn't that right? A. Yes.

Q. And you called up Mr. Mandel, did you not? A. That is right.

Q. Did you tell him what happened here? A. No, we did not discuss what happened.

Q. You didn't discuss it over the phone at all, as to what happened here that morning?

Mr. Lenvins: He answered.

The Witness: Not over the phone, we did not.

By Mr. Marcantonio:

Q. You did not. And so you made a luncheon appointment with him over the telephone, is that right? A. Yes.

Q. And that is all you said over the telephone, you just had a luncheon appointment with him? A. I told him that the hearing adjourned unusually early and he asked why, and I said, "Well, I can't tell you over the telephone," so I met him later on.

3547 Q. You met Mr. Mandel at lunch, correct? A. Yes.

Q. Did you discuss what transpired that morning with Mr. Mandel? A. Yes, I told him the hearings were adjourned for ten days and that the chairman threatened to resign as chairman from the Panel.

Q. That is all you told him? A. That was substantially what we talked about.

3555 Q. Mr. Witness, at any time in your conversations with Mr. Mandel and at any place did you ever discuss the conduct of the Board or the members of the Panel in this case?

Mr. Lenvin: I object. It is wholly irrelevant.

Mr. LaFollette: That objection will be sustained.

3559 Q. Have you ever given any instructions—you say as a result of what you learned in Moscow you gave lessons here in this country, did you not? A. Yes.

3708 Q. At page 1560, do you remember being asked this question by Mr. Lenvin:

“Q. In view of Mr. Abt’s statement, I ask Mr. Kornfeder if he has ever seen this particular issue of ‘The Communist’ dated March 1, 1921? A. Yes, I have. This is the official organ of the then completely united Communist Party of America.”

Do you recall being asked that question and making that answer? A. Yes.

Q. Then, do you recall Mr. Lenvin saying he didn’t have photostats at that time and that before he would introduce it he would show it to the chairman. Then it was marked for identification, and then the Chairman made a ruling on having it marked for identification and a ruling in connection with the photostats and that document that you identified was then admitted into evidence and it became Petitioner’s Exhibit 123.

3709 That was the document that you identified as the official organ of the then completely united Communist Party of America, is that correct, Mr. Witness? A. Yes.

Mr. Marcantonio: May I have Petitioner’s Exhibit 123?

By Mr. Marcantonio:

Q. Then you recall Mr. Lenvin saying the following:

"Mr. Lenvin: In view of Mr. Abt's previous statement, Mr. Chairman, I will now read from page 2 of this Exhibit, entitled 'Resolutions adopted by C. P. Convention, February, 1921,' sub-heading 'Resolution on Acceptance of the 21 points for affiliation with C. I.

"'Communist Party of America, Section of the Communist Party of America, assembled in its special convention held in February, 1921, hereby reaffirms its position as an integral part of the Communist International. Special Convention, in conformity with the conditions for admission, adopted by the Second World Congress of the Communist International, and after discussion and due deliberation, endorses and adopts unanimously on roll call vote the 21 points for affiliation with the Communist International as binding upon all the delegates present and for its entire membership without any reservations.'"

3710 Do you recall Mr. Lenvin reading this to the Panel here after you had identified Petitioner's Exhibit 123 as the official organ of the then completely united Communist Party of America? A. I don't recall him reading it. I recall the item.

Q. You recall the item and you recall having identified it as an organ of the then completely united Communist Party of America. Look at it. Tell this Panel if that is an organ of the then completely united Communist Party of America? A. Yes; as far as I know, it is.

Q. You still say that it is? A. Yes.

Q. All right. Now, Mr. Witness, start with the first column on the left, right here, read to the Board this paragraph here, commencing with the word "after." A. "After waiting in vain for the United Communist Party to comply with the mandate of the Communist International to hold a joint convention upon the basis of proportional representation with the Communist Party, in order to effect unity between these two parties, a convention was called by the C. E. C. in compliance with 21 points for affiliation with the Communist International and to revise its program and

constitution in conformity with the thesis and statutes of the C. I."

3711 Q. Now, do you still say that this is the organ of the completely united Communist Party, of the then completely united Communist Party of America? A. No, I am in error.

Redirect Examination

3737 Q. When you applied for a passport in 1927, did you swear falsely? A. Yes.

Q. Why? A. My instructions were to obtain a passport under somebody else's citizenship papers.

Q. Did you make any false statements in your application for a passport when you applied for one in 1930 to go to South America? A. No, not to my knowledge.

Q. Mr. Kornfeder, did you teach at any Communist Party schools? A. Yes.

Q. Can you identify the school and the date when you taught? A. I taught a course in what then was known as the Workers School in New York at the National Party headquarters on the subject of communist labor union tactics and the strategy and, also, on the subject of Leninism.

3741 Q. What did you teach regarding your course in communist labor union strategy tactics? A. Well, under that course I taught how to organize secretly, instead of unorganized plants, how to form groups inside of labor unions for the purpose of getting control of such labor unions, how to prepare for a strike and how to carry on a strike after a strike is called out. That, in brief, was the substance of that course.

Q. And what did you teach regarding Leninism? A. Leninism, I taught the main doctrines of Lenin which called for the complete and total overthrow of all existing social institutions, the Government, the existing organizations that support the Government, the complete elimination of

the present state structure and its substitution by a dictatorship led by the Communist Party.

3772

William Odell Nowell

was called as a witness on behalf of the Petitioner,
3773 and having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

Direct examination.

3774

Q. So that you were a member of the Communist Party from approximately the middle of June, 1929, until December of 1936; is that correct? A. That is correct.

Q. Now, at the time that you joined the Communist Party, where were you employed? A. I was employed by the Ford Motor Company.

Q. Where? A. Detroit, Michigan.

3775

Q. And what particular unit or branch of the Communist Party did you join? A. I was assigned to—my recollection is that it was Unit 3, Shop Unit 3, as a Ford shop unit.

Q. Mr. Nowell, what is meant by "shop unit"? A. A shop unit is a group of Communist Party members employed in industry.

Q. At the time that you joined the Party, that is the Communist Party of the United States, did you take an oath or pledge of membership? A. I did.

Q. Do you recall the substance of that pledge? A. Yes, I do.

Q. Will you give us the substance of that pledge, please? A. The substance, as I recall it, is that I would carry out the line of the Communist Party, carry out assignments that were given to me at all times and at all times adhere to the principles of the Communist Party and the Comintern. That is the essence. The exact wording, I am not sure.

3787 Q. In the organizational structure, and in actual practice, in what manner is authority and discipline imposed on the membership of the Communist Party?

3788 The Witness: All lower committees in the Communist Party are subordinate to the higher committees, therefore, in actual practice authority descends upon the membership from the top.

Q. How far from the top, sir? What is the main organization from which the authority and discipline flows down?

A. In the National Party during my membership, the main authority was the Central Committee. Above it stood the Executive Committee of the Communist International which was the top authority.

3818 Q. Let's get this straight. What does TUUL stand for, sir? A. That is Trade Union Unity League.

Q. And what was the Trade Union Unity League? A. It was a national parent organization affiliated with the Red International Labor Unions in Moscow.

Q. And you say that the Automobile Union, Workers Union, that you belonged to was a member of the TUUL? A. It was.

Q. How do you know that? A. I represented the Auto Workers Union at the founding convention of the TUUL in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1929.

Q. I think you have explained, but I didn't get it straight. What was, rather, the TUEL? A. That was the Trade Union Educational League, a similar national organization, national parent to which various independent Communist-controlled unions were affiliated. It was an organization controlled by the Communist Party.

Q. What instructions, if any, did you receive in connection, as to your duties and the purpose of organizing the TUUL, in substance?

Mr. Abt: The witness has not testified that he did take part in organization the TUUL.

Mr. LaFollette: I think he said he attended the 3819 founding convention of the TUUL. I understood him to say that. Go ahead.

Mr. DeNunzio: That is what I thought.

The Witness: In the early summer of 1929, we received instructions from the Central Committee of the Party to prepare the groundwork for the organization of the TUUL. National organizers were sent out to assist the districts in preparing the groundwork for this convention, which was the founding convention of the TUUL.

There was an elaborate program worked out prior to the convention, which was adopted at the convention and later published. It outlines the entire program of the TUUL. There is too much detail to it to go into it here. The central idea was to organize industrial workers in the basic industries.

Q. What kind of industries? A. In the basic industries.

Q. Very well. A. And to maintain hegemony in these unions and to use them as schools of Communism and as a means of bringing economic pressure and collapsing the National Economy and facilitating, that is in aiding and facilitating the revolution, the proletarian revolution.

3821 Q. You have stated that the TUUL was affiliated in some way with the Red International. Is that right? A. That is correct.

Q. How do you know that, sir? A. I personally have reported to the Red International of Labor Unions in Moscow for my union and for the TUUL in the Profintern.

3844 Q. During your membership in the Communist Party, did you join any other organization, in addition to those that you have already testified to, on orders, requests or instructions from any member or officer of the Communist Party of the United States? A. I did.

Q. What other organizations? A. I joined the Workers Educational Association which was in charge of the cultural activities.

Q. Give us the date, please, at what time. A. I joined that association around the latter part of 1929 or first of 1930.

Miss McHale: I didn't get the name of the association.

The Witness: The Workers Educational Association. This association was in charge of the workers camp, an immigration organization operated by the Communist Party.

By Mr. DeNunzio:

Q. A workers camp? A. Yes.

Q. What kind of a camp was that? A. It was a 3845 camp operated for immigrational purposes ostensibly, but was used to bring people closer to the Communist Party, to supply them with entertainment and lectures and various types of recreation.

Q. Where was this camp situated? A. It was located at 12 Mile and Halstead Roads outside of Detroit.

Q. Was that located near or in the City of Detroit? A. Near the City of Detroit.

Q. Now, did you hold any office in the Workers Educational Association camp which brought you in connection with this camp? A. Yes, I did.

Q. What office did you hold? A. I was president of the Workers Educational Association, that is, the Michigan chapter, and Director of Cultural Activities for the workers camp.

Q. As an officer, what were your duties in connection with this camp? A. My duties were to carry out the educational program, arrange lectures, secure speakers, hold forums, prepare campaigns. Generally that covered my work as cultural director.

Q. Did you have occasion to visit the camp? A. I did.

3846 Q. During what period of time? A. Oh, from 1930 up through 1936.

Q. 1930 through 1936? A. Except for about a year and a half when I was away.

Q. How often did you visit that camp, if you recall? A. Almost weekly.

Q. Would it be during the mid-week or weekends, or when during the week? A. Mostly weekends.

Q. On the occasion of your visit at the camp, was there other attendance, other individuals, other people at the camp? A. Yes, there were.

Q. What was their purpose there? A. Well, the larger number were there for recreational purposes. Also quite a number from the communist-controlled organizations were there in addition to cultivate the new-comers for political purposes.

Q. During your visits to this camp, were there any speeches or lectures in connection with any political activities? A. Yes, there were.

Q. Can you give us the nature or the substance of any one of those speeches? A. I don't know whether I recall the specific words—

Q. The nature: A. —of the speech. Most of the
3847 candidates that had been run for office came there and spoke. We frequently had speakers from the national office of the Communist Party, speakers from the communist-controlled trade unions and sometimes outside speakers who were not members of the Communist Party.

Mr. LaFollette: May I interrupt you, Mr. DeNunzio?

Mr. DeNunzio: Yes sir.

Mr. LaFollette: When you say "most of them were political candidates," you mean political candidates of the Communist Party or candidates of any party who might be running in the Detroit area?

The Witness: Just the candidates running on the communist slate.

By Mr. DeNunzio:

Q. Mr. Nowell, on the occasion of your visit to this camp, did you notice any emblems or flags on display at the camp?

A. I have seen flags there on occasions.

Q. Are you able to describe to us at this time those flags or emblems that you may have seen there? A. We had the American flag, we had the Red flag on some occasions, decorations, and some other emblems. I don't recall just the exact nature of them.

* * * * *

3849 Q. Will you please describe the Red Flag that you saw on occasions at that camp? A. The flag was a solid red background with a hammer and sickle in the center.

Q. A sickle? A. A hammer and sickle in the center.

Q. Do you know of what nation that flag was? A. Yes, I do.

Q. What nation? A. The Soviet Union.

* * * * *

3860 Q. Mr. Nowell, let me ask you, do you know at whose direction the Red flag was displayed at that camp? A. No, I don't know who was directly responsible, that is the person, but we had what we called an anti-militarist group.

* * * * *

3861 The Witness: I know who kept the flags and were responsible for putting them up. I was going to say

3862 that an anti-militarist group which the Party maintained was in charge of putting up those flags and I do know who was in charge of that.

Mr. LaFollette: All right. Who was that?

The Witness: I don't know that they put this flag up. I was not there when it was raised.

Mr. LaFollette: Who was in charge of this group?

The Witness: George Sleigh; John Marr, and another active worker in the group was Ed Goldheimer.

Other members of this group—I don't recall all of the names—but I knew them by sight.

Q. Now, do you know the purpose for displaying the Red flag of Russia at these camps?

3864 The Witness: I do know the purpose from experience, for the reason that the flag was raised.

By Mr. DeNunzio:

Q. Keep your voice up. A. I say I do know why it was raised.

Mr. LaFollette: How do you know?

The Witness: On my return, before I went to Russia as a delegate in 1929, I carried—that is when I went I carried a flag from my union to the workers of an automobile plant in Moscow. Jeanett Pearl who was National Organizer of the friends of the Soviet Union gave me thorough instructions as to the purpose of this exchange of flags. It was a Red flag with the Auto Workers emblem rather than the hammer and sickle. I brought back a huge flag, almost as large as one of those windows, a red velvet flag with a hammer and sickle in the center. I used that flag at lectures on Russia, so my experience in the exchange of these flags and using the Red flag is that it was used to bring people nearer to the Communist ideology, to make friends for Soviet Russia. In other words, emblem signifies the fatherland of the working class in Communist parlance or Communism as practiced in Soviet Russia, so it was an invitation
3865 for them to come closer to or come into the Communist Party. It was designed to influence them towards Communism.

3878 Q. Do you know whether or not the Daily Worker was an official organ of the Communist Party? A. Yes, it was the official organ.

3893 Q. Mr. Nowell, did there come a time when you did arrive in Russia? A. There did.

Q. And after arriving in Russia, what did you do as a delegate? A. I personally, together with the other members of the delegation, went into a conference with the representative from the American Communist Party in Russia.

Q. What was the name of that representative? A. His name was John Ballum.

Q. Is that "n-m" or "a-m"? A. "U-m."

Mr. Abt: "U-m."

By Mr. DeNunzio:

Q. And do you know what Communist body—yes, what Communist body in the United States he represented
3894 at the Communist International? A. He was the representative from the Communist Party of the United States to the Communist International, at least one of them.

Q. On the occasion of this conference of the American delegates with Mr. Ballum, did you discuss anything in connection with trade unions? A. Yes, I did.

The Witness: He informed me, and that was my first meeting with Mr. Ballum, he informed me that he was a member of the Trade Unions and had represented the TUUL and the old TUEL in the Red International Unions in Moscow.

Q. Did you meet at that time any other American representatives of the Communist Party in Russia? A. I did.

Q. Can you name any of those for us, that is, in addition to the members who traveled as U. S. Delegates? A. I met—one may say these are representatives. They were students in the Lenin School, some of whom were serving in the Communist International and on certain bureaus.

I met Harry Haywood, who was serving on the International Negro Bureau of the Communist International. I met William L. Patterson, who was a student in the Lenin School at the time. I met Celia Parinsky from the American Communist Party. She was our interpreter. And several other students from the American Communist Party in the Far Eastern University.

Q. You have mentioned the name of William Patterson. Is that the same William Patterson who is now the National Secretary of the Civil Rights Conference? A. Yes, it is the same Patterson.

3954 Q. Mr. Nowell, what purpose did that pamphlet serve the members of the Party? A. This pamphlet, being the Thesis and Resolutions of the Seventh Convention, was the prime authority in the program policy and tactical orientation for the period between 1930 and 1934.

3968 Q. What was the nature of the discussion that you had with Mr. Stachel? A. Well, Stachel began the discussion. He approached me after the convention and told me that it was unfortunate that I had made the kind of speech that I did, that I had been recommended, and was a candidate for the Central Committee of the Party, and they were forced to remove my name because my speech did not conform to the program and policy of the Communist International on the negro question.

3969 He went on to state that his reason for supplying me with the latest point of view of the Comintern, in the series of articles that had appeared before the convention, was that I would not fall into such an error.

I stated to Stachel that I had expressed my honest point of view. Perhaps I was not clear on the question, but I spoke what seemed to me to be the proper orientation towards this question in the so-called black belt, as well as the problems of negroes in the northern states.

That was the gist of the conversation that took place between myself and Stachel.

3972 Q. I show you what has been marked for identification Petitioner's Exhibit 134—

(The document referred to was marked Petitioner's Exhibit 134 for identification.)

By Mr. DeNunzio:

Q. —I show you what purports to be a bound volume of the publication known as "The Communist" for the period of January through June, 1931, and I direct your attention to the article appearing in the February, 1931, issue of "The Communist," and I further
3973 direct your attention to page 153 of that issue, and ask you whether or not you have seen a similar issue of "The Communist" containing the same article, that is, an article with the identical text? A. Yes, I have seen a similar issue containing this resolution, this same text.

Q. What is the title of that resolution? A. The title is "Resolution on the negro question in the United States."

Q. And will you read the next line, which is in italics? A. The next line reads, "Final text, confirmed by the Political Commission of the E. C. C. I."

Q. And as a member of the Communist Party, what significance did the confirmation by the Political Commission of the E. C. C. I. have to you? A. That confirmation meant to me that the Executive Committee of the Communist International passed this resolution.

3974 Q. Mr. Nowell, was there any difference in the
 3975 theory expressed in the second resolution, from the
 theory expressed in the first resolution?

3977 The Witness: There is no difference in the funda-
 mental theory. That is, that the negroes in the
 Black Belt of the south constitute a nation, but the second
 resolution goes much further and is critical of a certain,
 what we learned to be, incompleteness of the first resolu-
 tion, and the use of terminology which the latter resolution
 deems misleading, and basically, theoretically erroneous.

That one word I want to refer to is "race." The
 3978 Comintern became very critical of the use of that
 term in theorizing on the negro question, following
 the Fourth Congress of the Communist International.

The resolution, here, which I studied and taught, states
 that the negro question, in the United States, is a national
 question, rather than a race question, that the basis of
 this question is the agrarian problem—that is the problem
 of agriculture, of backwardness and medieval remnants in
 agriculture, and the exploitation of these remnants, as the
 resolution indicates, by finance capital.

Thus it contends that in the basis for its strategy, in
 dealing with this problem in the south, must involve tactics
 applicable to the agrarian revolution.

Therefore, the negroes having certain economic condi-
 tions in common, and a certain territory in common, where
 it is said that they constitute a majority, a certain culture
 in common, and of similar racial origin, which has resulted
 in their being more or less delineated as a separate group,
 has produced, the resolution contends, the basic character-
 istics of nationality as opposed to race.

Therefore, the second resolution rejects the designation
 of race, as basic, in the analysis and treatment of the
 question.

It also plays down industrialization in the South which
 the previous resolution emphasizes, and on which later

3979 the Party split with Jay Lovestone and others, the latter of whom held the theory that industrialization would liquidate the backward areas of the South, indicating that the problem there could be solved after a democratic fashion rather than through rebellion and revolution. At least the Comintern read that into it.

The third difference is that while the first revolution puts forward the demand for self-determination, it does not specifically state that the Communist Party shall demand, or demands, self-determination up to the point of separation, unconditionally.

This resolution, the last one, demands unconditional autonomy—separation, or secession, and the establishment of a separate negro government in the Black Belt of the South.

However, it, as the former resolution, but in a manner more elaborate, states that in case this rebellion should occur as a part of the Proletariat revolution and self-determination should be achieved as a result of this whole process, and the conclusion of such a rebellion and revolution should establish a Soviet America, it would be the duty of Communists to urge the negro republic to become a part of Soviet America.

If no such revolution has occurred, that is no such Proletarian revolution has occurred, the Communist Party of the United States shall support the rebellious government of that republic in its opposition to the 3980 Government of the United States, destined to weaken the Government of the United States, and aid the Communist Party in the precipitating and executing the Proletarian revolution.

These are essentially the differences in those resolutions.

Q. Mr. Nowell, are you familiar with the origin of the second resolution? A. I am familiar with it.

Q. Where did it originate? A. That resolution was drawn and passed by the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

Q. How do you know that? A. At the 1930 Plenum, which was held in New York around August, or at least the latter part of 1930, the Central Committee had the resolution.

My recollection is—and I am reasonably certain that my recollection is correct—that it was announced, and discussed the matter personally with Jack Stachel, that the completed text of the resolution had arrived.

This latter resolution took the place of the former, 3981 as a continuation of the line of the Communist International on the negro question in the United States.

I further confirmed the source of this resolution in Moscow, in 1931, when I was a student in the International Leninism School, studied the resolution there as a part of the national and colonial question.

I also discussed it at length with Otto Kuusinen, Secretary of the Communist International, head of the Anglo-American Commission, who edited the resolution.

So from my own experience in dealing with the E. C. C. I. and its members, I know that this resolution was drawn and passed by them, and sent to the American Communist Party, to be carried out.

Q. During your membership in the Communist Party, was the program for the self-determination of the negroes in the United States ever repudiated or abandoned by the Communist Party of the United States? 3982 A. No, it was not.

Q. During your membership in the Party, were any steps taken by the Communist Party to implement this program? A. Yes, definite organizational steps were taken to implement this program, and execute it in practice.

3994 Q. Mr. Nowell, you testified earlier that you also made a trip to Russia in 1931, is that correct? A. That is correct.

Q. When, in 1931, did you make the second trip? A. I left the United States in the later part of August, if I remember correctly around August 26, and arrived in Russia in September, the first of September.

Q. What was the reason—

Mr. Marcantonio: I didn't get that.

Mr. DeNunzio: August 26, 1931.

By Mr. DeNunzio:

Q. What was the reason for your second trip? A. I was sent to attend the International Lenin School.

3996 Q. Did any individual or individuals tell you the purpose of sending you to the Lenin School? A. Yes. Yes, they did.

Q. Who were those individuals, if you remember? A. Ralph Baker, who was then National Organizational Secretary, explained to me why I was being sent, and Earl Browder explained to the students as a group, why they were being sent to the International Lenin School.

Q. What did they say was the reason for you being sent to the Lenin School? A. Browder explained to me, along with—

Q. Who was that? A. Browder.

Q. All right. A. Browder explained to me, along
3997 with others, that we were being sent to the International Lenin School to be trained as professional revolutionarists, as Party leaders, that the revolutionary movement was growing, that the world's economic crisis was intensifying, that revolutionary situations were developing in a number of countries, and that this demanded that the Party pay particular attention to the development of leadership and raising the political and ideological leadership of its membership to compete with this objective political situation.

He went on further to state that it would be our duty, on our return, to apply what we learned there in the lines

of socialism to the condition in the United States for the ultimate overthrow of American capital, the American Government, and the establishment of a Soviet America.

Baker gave more technical instructions. He told me that I particularly was being sent because they thought I needed some clarification on certain questions. That while I had certain qualities that the Party admired and which could be very useful to it, they felt that I would gain a great deal by studying there for a year or a year and a half, and that he wanted me to commend myself to the job they had for me there and try to make the best possible use of my studies.

Q. Did others from your district make the same trip with you? A. Yes, there were several others.

3998 Q. From your district? A. Yes.

Q. Were there students from other districts, if you know? A. Yes, there were students from several other districts, also.

Q. And did you travel in a body? A. We did.

Q. In a group? A. Yes, we traveled on the same boat. In that sense, we traveled in a group.

Q. From what port did you embark to make the trip? A. New York.

Q. And who made the arrangements for your passage to Russia? A. Irvin Potash was placed in charge of arrangements for the delegation, and he did make the arrangements and secured tickets and so on.

Q. Did you pay for your own passage? A. I did not.

Q. Do you know whether or not other members of your group paid for their passage? A. I don't know definitely, but I am sure they didn't.

Q. Do you know who paid for your passage to Russia?

A. I do know that the Central Committee paid our
3999 fares. They dispensed the money for the tickets.

Q. How do you know that? A. I was told, personally mentioned the fact that the expenses, the instructions of the District were, that the Central Committee would pay the expenses of the students.

I was also told again in New York by Baker, and I understand each student was also told the same, that since the Committee was paying our fares, that we were responsible to it in our conduct and in our studies, to make good in our studies abroad.

Q. You mentioned the name Irving Potash. Who was Irving Potash? What position did he hold with the Communist Party? A. Potash at that time was a member of the Central Committee, and of course the Party. He was also a Trade Union leader there in New York, which is not a Party organization directly, and if I remember correctly he was also a member of the Trade Union Commission of the Central Committee, and a member of the National Board, along with me, of the TUUL.

Q. Mr. Nowell, did you testify in the New York trial of the eleven Communists? A. I did.

Q. Was Irving Potash one of the eleven defendants?

4001 The Witness: Yes, he was.

By Mr. DeNunzio:

Q. And is he the same Potash who made arrangements for your trip to Russia? A. Yes, he is the same person.

Q. Mr. Nowell, do you remember the names of any of the other students who made this trip with you? A. Yes, I remember some of them.

Q. Would you name them, please?

The Witness: As I recall, Charlie White, George Hewitt, from New York, Sam Nessin, from New York, Beatrice Siskin, Phillip Raymond, John Marr, William Brown—there were approximately 30 in the delegation. Some I know under aliases, and I don't know their correct names.

4002 Q. Mr. Nowell, was there any member of the Communist Party who was in charge of your group, enroute to Russia? A. Yes, there were.

Q. Was there more than one? A. Yes, there were three, in fact.

Q. Then will you name them, giving their official positions, on the occasion of this trip? A. Potash was in charge. He was the head of the committee in charge. He was assisted by Beatrice Siskin or Beatrice Shields and another member whose name was John Seven. That is an alias. I have forgotten his correct name.

* * * * *

4003 Q. Before embarking on the ship, did you receive any instructions from any members or officials of the Communist Party as to your behavior enroute to Russia? A. Yes, we did receive such instructions.

Q. And from whom? A. From Mr. Potash.

Q. And will you give us the nature of those instructions, as to what your behavior should be? A. Well, he instructed us not to use our correct names as he couldn't be sure who was on the boat and he wanted our identity and our destination concealed, as nearly as possible, that in port we should not go out together in large groups—at least not more than two—to beware of strangers, not to talk to strangers

4004 about any political subjects, and to not attend any public meetings, and to come in at a reasonable hour, to be sure not to get embroiled in anything that might make our identity known to the police.

Those were essentially the instructions—oh, and more, not to associate together on the boat, to keep apart as much as possible and not talk with strangers.

Q. And in conformity with those instructions did you use a name other than your own name? A. I recall that I did pick up some sort of a name for the passage. I don't recall just what it was now.

Q. You don't recall which name you used? A. Not on the boat. I recall the name I used later, in Russia, but for the passage I just simply didn't use my own name. I chose some name at random.

* * * * *

4010 Q. Do you know if the Anglo-American Secretariat was responsible to any higher authority in connection with administering the Lenin School? A. Yes, it was.

Q. To what authority was it responsible? A. It was responsible to the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

4011 Q. How do you know that? A. I knew that from contact with both, in the solution of certain problems that arose in the course of my studies at the International Lenin School.

I worked closely with the Anglo-American Commission throughout the year and four months that I was in the school, and at the conclusion, or near the conclusion of the term, I sat with the Anglo-American Commission and the Political Secretariat of the E. C. C. I., and participated in the drawing of a resolution for the American Communist Party.

This resolution was designed to end the factional situation that had arisen in the Lenin School and in the American Communist Party.

* * * * *

4014 Q. What subjects were you taught at the Lenin School? A. We were taught Marxism and Leninism, Marxian Economics, history of the labor movement, trade union and strike strategy, history of the Communist International, and its organizational structure, history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, history of the American Communist Party, the national and colonial question, international propaganda, and we were taught certain practical subjects.

We studied the structure at first hand of the Soviet system in Russia, its economic structure, and the theory and practice of Soviet economy, both theoretically and practically.

We also studied the science of civil warfare, also a practical subject.

i believe that covers most of the subjects we studied.

Q. As an American student, were you taught any subjects which had special application to the United States?

A. Yes, we did study such subjects.

Q. What subjects were those? A. Well, most of our subjects—in fact all, as far as possible—were what the 4015 school heads term “nationalized.” Not only did we study the theory of Marx, Lenin and Stalin, and other Communist leaders, and the program of the Communist International, but we adapted it to the particular conditions of the United States, in accordance with instructions and documents of the Communist International, analyzing the economic and political conditions in the United States.

Hence, in the science of civil warfare we took into account the particular political and economic conditions of the United States, the culture of the people, the terrain, the whole of the history of this country and the history of the Communist Party; and up to the moment political analyses of feelers to determine the degree of political maturity of the revolution in the United States.

Therefore, in this elaborate practical subject, the science of civil warfare, we were taught to adapt that particularly; both politically and militarily, to the conditions prevailing within the United States, with the object of actually destroying the economic system in the States, and establishing the dictatorship of the Proletariat.

Q. Specifically, what were you taught in the course in civil warfare? A. Well, as a continuation of our theoretical studies, most of which in themselves were a science of class warfare, in fact they were a science of class warfare, we were taught how, in theory and also in practice, to 4016 convert economic strikes into political strikes, and thence into general strikes, that would lead, if the political conditions were mature, to rebellion and uprisings, and could possibly precipitate the revolution.

In actually carrying out the revolution, we were taught the military details, both in legal warfare, and in guerilla

fighting: how to carry through, in the capturing of cities, through the building of barricades, barricade fighting, sniping, hand grenade throwing; we were taught code—secret code—and we were drilled in gas mask drills, target practice, we were taught to sabotage, how to take over the system of transportation, or sever it to make it useless to the legitimate government forces, to seize the food supply to feed the guerilla fighters, and how to deflect, as a continuation of our work started in the armed forces, deflect detachments of the Army to fight with the insurgents and the guerilla fighters, and could combine illegal warfare with legal warfare.

Also, we were taught the value of, and how, to take and hold hostages, capture arsenals and how to arm communist supporters, and to utilize communications system or make it useless for anyone else who wanted to use it, and even controlling or destroying the food supply, the water supply, and whatever proved to be the better tactic in waging total revolution for the capture of power.

4017 These were some of the major tactical measures that we were taught in the science of civil warfare.

4022 Q. All right, Mr. Nowell. Now, directing your attention to the time in which you were a student in the Lenin School, did any of the subjects which you studied involve the negro question in the United States? A. Yes.

Q. What was the nature of the subject or subjects, concerning the negro question in the United States? A. It was taught as a part of the national and colonial question.

Q. And what were you taught specifically, concerning the program for self-determination of the Negro in the United States?

4023 The Witness: We were taught; in the International Lenin School, that the Negro question in the United States was a part of the colonial question; differing from

the classical colonial problem in some respects, but generally of the same character; that the foundation of the colonial problem was the agrarian problem and imperialist exploitation by the mother countries, mother imperial countries.

Therefore, the basic demand and necessity and struggle of the colonial people, that the communists must lead, was for the right of self-determination, for national independence from the mother countries, and that we were to establish a hegemony over these movement, and to break and to help these colonial countries break themselves away from the mother countries, and thereby to weaken those countries and aid the Proletariat and the Communist Party in those countries to precipitate and carry through with a proletarian revolution and the establishment of a communist dictatorship.

Therefore, the Negro question in the United States—this applied also to the Negro question in the United States, because it was of the same general character as the colonial problem.

4024 Mr. LaFollette: Who taught the course in Russia?

The Witness: There was a Russian instructor who taught that course. I don't recall his name now.

Mr. LaFollette: Proceed, Mr. DeNunzio.

By Mr. DeNunzio:

Q. Did you at any time, during the course involving the negro question, state any views concerning the self-determination program? A. I did state my views on the question.

Q. And were the views which you expressed in classes substantially the same as the ones you had expressed at the seventh communist convention? A. They were essentially the same.

Q. Were you in favor or opposed to the program for the self-determination of the Negro? A. I was opposed to self-determination for the Negroes in the United States.

Q. Did any of the other students in the American section express their views in connection with the negro question?

A. Yes, some did. Others sympathized, although they didn't express themselves openly.

Q. Did any of those students hold the same view you have? A. Many of the students of the American Lander group held similar opinions as mine.

Mr. LaFollette: We will rise until 3:15 at this time.

(Recess taken.)

4025 Mr. LaFollette: Come to order, please.

Proceed, Mr. DeNunzio.

By Mr. DeNunzio:

Q. Mr. Nowell, why were you and some of the other students opposed to the program for the Negro question in the United States? A. I can only speak for myself in this case, otherwise it would be hearsay.

I do know why the others said they were opposed to the self-determination, but—

Q. Well, state why you were opposed? A. —but I will just state my own position.

Having studied the Negro problem in the South ever since my youth, being a Southerner myself, I understood it, and I still understand it fairly well.

I studied all of these so-called characteristics of nationality, I compared the Negro question in the United States with that of certain colonial countries, like Jamaica, Africa, China, India, and various other colonial countries, and I found distinct differences, and certain peculiarities about the Negro question in the United States that does not or did not then, nor does now, exist among the colonial peoples.

Major among these is this: that Negroes, even in the southern part of the United States, are distributed about among the remainder of the population in a way that
4026 you cannot say that they are in any separate or distinct territory.

Secondly, the culture of American Negroes is basically American. It varies in some respects, but is basically American. Religion, language, more or less common territory, and even economic circumstances are pretty generally the same. The system of land tenure is not only limited to Negroes. It is also true of a large number of white farmers in the South.

Therefore, I did not feel, on the basis of a scientific analysis of this economic problem, and the other so-called national characteristics, or those things that constitute national characteristics, that they were sufficiently prominent to warrant a demand or a movement for separation and secession from the territory of the United States and the establishment of a separate government.

Further, I concluded that the policy of the Communist Party, insisting mechanically on such an end, would lead to the setting up or the attempt to set up a buffer state, almost in a pincher between two major portions of American territory. It would be an antagonistic buffer, constituting a minority, as it does; and used after a revolutionary fashion could do nothing more than provoke racial warfare and bloodshed and national chaos, and would lead to the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands, no doubt, of lives of colored and white Americans in futile combat for 4027 an attempt to achieve some revolutionary end dictated from Soviet Russia.

Mr. LaFollette: Excuse me, may I ask you just one thing? Was your word "feudal" or "futile?"

The Witness: "Futile."

Mr. LaFollette: All right.

The Witness: Therefore, sensing the danger inherent in this sort of strategy, and these tactics, and seeing the way that satellites are used and sacrificed by the Soviet system—

Mr. Abt: Objection, and move to strike, Mr. Chairman.

The Witness:—I could see—

Mr. LaFollette: Objection overruled.

The Witness: —I could see the parallel, between the use of this problem in the South, and the way that I had seen not only individuals but large sections, even of Communist Parties and nations, sacrificed futilely to protect the interests of the Communist hierarchy.

4029 Q. As a result of your views and expressions concerning the Negro question during your attendance at the Lenin School, was any action taken against you while you were in Russia? A. Yes.

Q. What action was taken?

Mr. LaFollette: Mr. DeNunzio, do I understand that the witness has testified that he stated these views which he has just stated now? That he stated them in Russia?

Mr. DeNunzio: Not these views. His opposition. That was my question.

Mr. LaFollette: All right. Go ahead.

Mr. DeNunzio: That was part of the reason for
4030 his opposition.

Mr. LaFollette: Let me ask you, Mr. Nowell. Did you state, to any of your fellow students, or did you state publicly, any of the facts which you have just related in your answer to your next previous question?

The Witness: I did.

Mr. LaFollette: While you were in Russia?

The Witness: I did, in essence.

Mr. LaFollette: All right.

The Witness: Perhaps not in as systematic a fashion as I am stating them here, but in essence I stated them.

Mr. LaFollette: All right. Go ahead, Mr. Witness.

The Witness: I was charged in an indictment and tried, in Russia.

By Mr. DeNunzio:

Q. What was the nature of the charges brought against you? A. I was charged with being in opposition to the line of the Communist International and the Central Com-

mittee of the American Communist Party on the Negro question.

Q. And by whom were the charges made? A. The charges were first made by the Bureau of the Lenin School, the Political Bureau, on instructions from and in collaboration with, representatives of the Communist International.

4031 Q. Did any representatives from the Communist Party in America participate in the charges filed against you? A. Yes, sir. Both in the original charge and the elaboration of those charges, and the further hearings, occurred after the first hearing or trial.

Q. Now directing your attention to the original charges, what members of the Communist International participated in the charges against you? State their names, if you recall them. A. A. Mangulin, of the Anglo-American Commission participated; Gerhardt Eisler, of the Anglo-American Commission, participated; Clarence Hathway, of the Anglo-American Commission, participated; Mrs. Irene Browder, wife of Earl Browder, participated.

Later, Joseph Piatnitsky himself, Organizational Secretary of the Communist International, participated.

And other members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States, who came to Russia.

4032 Q. How many charges were filed against you, Mr. Nowell? A. The original charge was elaborated into a series of at least two other charges, derived from the original charge.

In the first place, I was accused of a theoretical, political error, because of my disagreement with the political theory, practice, and policy of self-determination.

In the second charges, it was developed that I had pursued this so-called erroneous cause to the point where I was organizing factional support of my policy, my point of view.

And in the last analysis, and as a part of this second charge, because a number of other students of the Lenin School supported me, some of whom were colored, and some of whom were white, they charged that I organized a Negro group in support of my policies, not mentioning the fact that a large number of white students also supported me, and that this constituted Nationalism, Negro Nationalism.

So these were the two later charges that were developed out of the original charge.

Q. You say that Clarence Hathway participated in the charges filed against you?

Who was Clarence Hathway? A. Hathway was a representative from the American Communist Party to the Communist International.

Q. What position did he hold in the Communist International? A. He was American representative there, and a member of the Anglo-American Secretariat.

Q. Did Gerhardt Eisler participate in the charges? A. He did.

Q. Was he a representative to the Communist International? A. He was.

Q. Do you know what Communist Party, what nation he represented? A. At that time he represented the Communist Party of Germany.

Q. Do you know whether or not Morris Childs participated in the charges preferred against you? A. He did.

4034 Q. Who was Morris Childs? A. Morris Childs was a member of the Lander Secretariat of the Comintern. He was from the American Communist Party, and at that time was associated with Jack Yteschenko, who was OGPU Chief of Police of the School.

4035 Q. Do you recall the names of any other representatives to the Communist International who participated in the charges filed against you, besides the ones that you have already mentioned? A. Yes, I do.

Q. Name them, please. A. There was Bill Lawrence.

Q. Bill who? A. Bill Lawrence. That is an alias. I knew him under that alias. Beatrice Siskin. A fellow by the name of Yarris. I have forgotten his first name. Mintz. Professor of Philosophy. Peters.

Q. What is Peters' first name? A. William Peters. That is an alias, but it is one of the aliases he used.

Q. What position did he hold in the Communist Party? A. He succeeded Robert Minor as a representative from the American Communist Party to the Communist International.

Q. Was Robert Minor there at the time? You say he succeeded Robert Minor? A. Yes, he succeeded
4036 Minor, but Minor remained in Moscow.

Q. And what Communist Party did he represent? A. Minor represented the American Communist Party in the Communist International, succeeding Clarence Hathway.

Q. Can you recall any others who participated in the charges filed against you? A. Yes. Amy Schechter of New York, who was—

* * * * *

The Witness: Overgaard; Otto Huiswood, representative from the American Communist Party to the Red International of Trade Unions; Earl Browder, Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States at that time;

Harry Heywood, Member of the Central Committee
4037 of the American Communist Party.

* * * * *

Q. Did Jack Stachel participate in the charges filed against you? A. Yes, Stachel did participate.

Q. And what part did he take in the charges that were filed against you? A. Stachel, together with Brow-
4038 der, Gerhardt Eisler, and Harry Heywood, prosecuted the charges in a series of trials that were held, to mobilize the student body, which had been split on this issue. They made their speeches within the nature of a

prosecution. That was the type of participation that they took.

4049 Q. Did you meet any other Russian communists who were representatives to the Communist International whom you later met in the United States? A. Yes, I did.

4050 The Witness: One was Gerhardt Eisler, whom I had met in Russia in 1931 and 1932.

4051 Q. Well, did there come a time when you met Gerhardt Eisler in the United States? A. There did.

Q. And when did you meet Eisler in the United States? A. In the summer of 1933.

Q. Where did you meet him in the United States? A. I met him in the Party offices of the Communist Party in Detroit, Michigan.

Q. At the time that you met him, was he using the name of Eisler? A. No, he was not.

Q. What name was he using? A. He was using the alias, Edwards. However, in conversation, since I had known him about—

4054 Q. Now, directing your attention to the occasion when Earl Browder was in Russia, do you know whether or not he made any speeches before any bodies, other than the discussions which took place concerning the charges filed against you? A. Yes, he did make other speeches. At least one that I know about.

Q. Were you present? A. I was.

Q. Where was the speech made? A. It was made in the Communist International.

Q. Do you recall the nature of that speech? A. I do.

Q. Would you give us the substance of it, as you remember it? A. The speech dealt in substance with the Far

East, as it affected—as a part of the International situation Browder stated that his report was made for the Central Committee of the American Communist Party. He went on to analyze the progress of the depression in the United States, and generally the political and economic situation, and related it to the world situation.

Then he dealt at some length with what he called the “crystalization of an axis between Britain, the United States and Japan in the Far East,” for the purpose of launching an attack against Soviet Russia.

That constituted the essence of his speech.

Q. Were any of the other American students present at the time when he made this speech? A. Yes, the entire American student body was present, except a few who were out on vacation.

Q. One more question: Do you know whether or not members of the Communist International were present at the time that he made his speech? A. Yes, some were, at least. Joseph Piatnitsky was present, Otto Kuusinen was present, Gerhardt Eisler was present.

* * * * *

4062 Now, how do you know that this was a report being made for the Central Committee of the American Communist Party? A. Browder announced,

4063 when he took the stand in the Communist International, that he was making this report for the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the United States, a report which he had previously delivered before the Central Committee in the United States.

Q. On the occasion of this report, and in your presence, did anyone respond to his report? A. Yes, the Communist International, that is Kuusinen and Piatnitsky, and other members of the Executive Committee of the Comintern, had a conference, and they assigned the representative from the British Communist Party to rebut Browder's report, that is certain portions of it considered erroneous by

the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

Q. And do you recall the name of the British representative who was chosen to respond to the speech of Mr. Browder? A. I was trying to think of his name. At the moment, I don't. At the moment, I don't recall his name, I know him quite well, but his name slips me.

Q. You don't recall his name? A. For the moment, I don't.

Mr. DeNunzio: May I have this document marked Petitioner's Exhibit 135 for identification?

Mr. LaFollette: It may be so marked.

(The document referred to was marked Petitioner's Exhibit 135 for identification.)

4064 By Mr. DeNunzio:

Q. Mr. Nowell, I am going to show you what has been identified as Petitioner's Exhibit 135, which is a bound copy of the publication known as "The Communist" for the period January through June, 1932, the issue of April, 1932—

Mr. Abt: April or May?

Mr. LaFollette: The photostat is May, Mr. DeNunzio.

Mr. DeNunzio: I am sorry, it is May.

By Mr. DeNunzio:

Q. May, 1932, and I direct your attention to the article appearing on page 392, and ask you whether or not, during your membership in the Communist Party, you have seen a similar copy of "The Communist," containing an article with the identical text as that shown there? A. Yes, I have seen the issue, and the text.

Q. Will you read the title and what follows, before the text itself? A. The title is "Japan, America and the Soviet Union." The subheading reads: "Extracts from the speech of Earl Browder at the Plenum of the Central Committee, April 17, 1932."

4091 Q. While a student in Russia, did you pay your
4092 own living expenses? A. I did not.

Q. Who paid them? A. They were paid by the Communist International and the Russian Government.

Q. How do you know that? A. Well, we lived on Soviet property, as our dormitories.

Mr. Abt: Pardon?

Mr. LaFollette: As our dormitories.

The Witness: Our dormitories were on Soviet property. They were rent-free.

We ate in the school canteen or dining hall, and that was free. We were paid 50 rubles a month by Soviet citizens. Our traveling expenses were paid by the Russian Government and our expenses were paid by the Communist International and the Russian Government.

4094 Q. From whom did the fifty rubles a month come, that you received? A. We were paid by the school cashier, in the school's Secret Department.

Mr. Abt: In the School's what?

The Witness: Secret Department.

Mr. LaFollette: Secret Department. The School's Secret Department, S-e-c-r-e-t.

By Mr. DeNunzio:

Q. Did the other students receive the same monthly stipend that you received? A. They did.

4139 The Witness: Notably, as I testified to yesterday, or as I said in my testimony yesterday, near the conclusion of the term at the Lenin School; I was called into the Anglo-American Commission by Otto Kausinen, Secretary of the Communist International, to draft a resolution on the American question.

When the draft was completed, we took it to the Political Secretariat of the Executive Committee, and completed it.

4140 The Presidium, including Kuysinen, Manuilsky, Piatnitsky, Losovsky, and others, voted on the resolution in my presence, and instructed the American representative to carry out—to send a copy of this resolution to the Communist Party of the United States, and that this resolution be carried out. In answer to my question that a copy be sent to the Lenin School, and one to the District Committee of the Freunze District, of the Communist Party of Russia, Piatnitsky's answer to me was that "The decisions of the Comintern are binding, and this is why we are here, and I am going to send this document to the America Communist Party and if the Lenin School wants one they can have one."

4142 Q. On the occasion when you were a student at the
4143 Lenin School in Moscow, were you taught anything concerning the Communist theory of State? A. I was.

Q. Will you state what you were taught? A. I was taught the Leninist concept of the State. In that analysis of a State, as given to us in lectures, it was stated that the state arises as a result of irreconcilable class contradictions in society, and stands as a force in society, designed to force a reconciliation of class contradictions.

The conclusion reached by our instructor—and he frequently referred to the text—was that if such contradictions as he outlined could be reconciled peacefully, there would be no need for the State.

Therefore, he concluded that the State was an instrument of force, designed to force the will of one class on another. This was the elemental and lasting role of the State. Of course, he went on to develop the Communist concept of the State under more modern conditions, under the conditions of what he termed "imperialism," where the state becomes intertwined with—in fact, becomes the executive committee of the capitalist class, the instrument in the hands of the so-called capitalist class to suppress the